DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 765 SO 016 582

AUTHOR London, Perry
TITLE Behavior Control: The View from Nineteen Eighty Four.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ethics; *Futures (of Society); Literature; Political Issues; *Psychology; *Social Change; *Social Values; Technological Advancement; *Totalitarianism
IDENTIFIERS 1984 (Title); *Behavior Control; *Orwell (George)

ABSTRACT

Behavior control is not simply a matter with technological implications but a political issue as well. Orwell's "1984" is valuable because it confronts this issue and presents readers with a plausible scenario for the workings of a totalitarian state based on behavior control. The threat of "1984" is not only that government will have absolute control of people, but also that control can be systematized and made so successful in the destruction of individual personality that no one will want to deviate from the roles assigned to them by authority. The relationship of this threat to behavior control technologies is that the threat of total political control is one of the possibilities engendered by the promise of ever- improving biomedical and psychosocial therapeutic control. The important thing about behavior control technology is that the whole is more than the sum of the parts, that education, persuasion, and drugs are all forms of behavior control and, in combination, can lead us to the visions of "1984" or "Brave New World." What is necessary to escape this vision for the future is to actively create new scenarios which would allow the best human values to determine the uses to which technology is put, rather than accept a technological imperative which gives free reign to the uses to which technology is put. (IS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

★ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Perry London

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED257765

BEHAVIOR CONTROL: THE VIEW FROM NINETEEN EIGHTY FOUR

Perry London

Graduate School of Education

Harvard University

This is a year for apocalyptic visions to be revisited and revived. My essays on Behavior Control from 1969 on were not apocalyptic, but the topic fits the times, and I have been asked to revisit them in honor of 1984. As homage to George Orwell, a hero in my pantheon of great authors, I am pleased to do so.

My doubly ambiguous title refers to "behavior control" -- the book and the topic, and to "1984" -- the book and the year. So first I will quickly scan behavior control technology. Then, I will talk about its meaning in relation to George Orwell's novel. And then, I will speculate about a kind of ethical exercise the subject suggests may be useful to students of behavior control who worry about its decent political applications as well as its use in education, psychology and medicine.

Copyright © 1984
by
Perry London

Behavior control means, simply enough, getting someone to do your bidding. Behavior control technology is any systematic way of achieving that end. People have been trying to do that since the beginning of time, of course, but until recently, most means for doing so have been relatively crude. In general, education, persuasion, and force or the threat of force have been the only means for doing so.

Now, largely through developments in scientific psychology and medicine, a refined technology is developing, one relatively precise in the degree to which it can induce or change specific kinds of behavior.

•

Most of the techniques it uses can be catalogued in two groups:

The first type is methods which manipulate the information processed by our senses so that our own minds will guide our behavior in the direction the controller wants us to go. I called these Informational controls, but today they might be called psychosocial controls.

The second type of control works by affecting the physical mechanisms which underlie the senses, so we respond as the controller wishes regardless of what information is put to us. I have called these Coercive controls because they dictate behavior from its physiological sources, but they might better be called psychobiological controls.

Information controls include all the techniques conventionally associated with language and with education: Teaching; persuasion; propaganda; salesmanship; preaching; inspiration; demonstration; psychotherapy; behavior modification; conditioning; hypnosis; feedback; and bugging, i.e. monitoring or observing private behavior.

Coercive control, as I mean it, includes drugs, electrical stimulation of the brain (ESB), and psychosurgery mostly, but it will soon include genetic manipulation. Most of the things have had rather strictly medical uses, so far, with increasing successes in the control of psychiatric mood disorders, some symptoms of psychosis and soon, maybe, the relief of extreme phobias and panic states. Milder anxieties are already pretty well controlled by tranquilizing drugs. Energizing drugs, however, have been used non-medically as performance enhancers for athletes, astronauts, and college students studying for exams, and the possibilities for their broader use increase as drugs get better and the biochemistry of behavior better understood.

The distinction between information and coercion, or between psychosocial and psychobiological controls, so called, is convenient but not important. Eyeglasses, for instance, historically among the first scientific devices for improving human biology, partake of both. So do other prosthetic devices. So do mechanical contraceptives, which have an even longer history than spectacles. And as electronic

and bionic devices keep coming along, already familiar to everyone through commercial television, the distinction will become even fuzzier.

The really important distinction among behavior controls is between the familiar and the unfamiliar, between those with specific and those with diffuse effects, and between those that seem powerful and those that seem weak. In a nutshell, most people are less alarmed by information controls than they are by drugs and such. They feel it is easier to resist being controlled by lessons and sermons than by prescriptions and injections.

They are only partly right to feel this way. Under the right conditions, information has great power to move behavior. Socrates and Jesus, among others, were condemned to die because of the evident power of their teachings. And you remember what happened to the Roman crowd when Marc Antony came "to bury Caesar, not to praise him." Riots and revolutions are triggered by precept and inspiration. And totalitarian control of whole societies relies as much, maybe more, on the manipulation of information as on coercion. Indeed, George Orwell's 1984 is the chief literary work on the nightmare political possibilities of information control! And some scholars think that, if that nightmare were to become reality, the main instruments for pulling it off would be television, to control what people knew about what was going on, and computers, so the government could keep check on where we were and what we were doing (Rule, 1983).

When coercive behavior control technology started to get well known, and people began thinking about its political dangers, electrical stimulation of the brain seemed most ominous because it promised precise control over the brain centers that direct emotion. José Delgado's dramatic experiments got great publicity in this connection (1969). Probably millions of people saw the film in which he stopped an angry bull in the middle of a charge by a radio signal he sent from a small hand-held transmitter to a tiny receiver he had surgically implanted in its brain. The control of passionate action, especially of violence, was the big topic at issue then. The potential political threat was that, in addition to curing the helpless violence of some medical disorders, it would also be used to make political activists and dissenters into placid, even willing, victims of tyranny.

But the best literary work on the political nightmare of coercive controls is probably Aldous Huxley's Brave New World, where it is pleasure, not terror, that guarantees docility and, at the same time, robs life of meaning (1932). The great threat from biomedical technology, indeed, may be not just that it gives huge latitude of control over individual behavior, but that it forces us to redefine (if not to de-define) what it means to be human, by showing more and more clearly that there is no natural state of "humanness" to which we are reducible.

Whether informational or coercive, educational or invasive, usable on individuals only or en masse, rapid or slow in effects, and short-lived or irreversible, th technologies of behavior control are likely to be used beyond the domains of improvement, healing and relief for which they were invented. There seems to be a "technological imperative" at work in modern society which promotes the transfer of technology from one area to another. It is generally guided by benevolent or at least harmless intentions, but that does not matter. What matters is that you can transfer technologies with relative ease precisely because they are technological, i.e. systematic, or objective. The object of any technology is precision or efficiency. The closer it comes to total control with minimum waste at minimum cost, the better it is. The object of behavior control, as of any control technology, is total control of the behavior at issue.

The threatened misuse of behavior control technology has become so obvious to so many people that there are now many agencies and individuals keeping watch on it. The agencies range from the U.S. Office of Technology Assessment to the Institute for Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences, and the people from physicians, lawyers, ethicists, clergy, biological, behavioral, social, and physical scientists, to lunatics, crackpots, and the Congress of the United States. Their common concern is to protect individuals from

exploitation and to see that these technologies are used in the public interest. The critical questions they must ask in order to do so concern the selection of users, of beneficiaries (or victims) and of conditions of use. Put simply, the questions are: Who shall be controlled? By whom? How? Now, these are the traditional questions of politics and government, not in relation to healing and repair, but to social control in general. That they are the same questions for healers and for governors starts to suggest the inevitable political implications of behavior control.

Orwell's 1984

This brings us to G. Orwell's book: 1984. It is a grim tale of a totalitarian England two generations after World War II, ruled by a ruthless bureaucracy which controls people by a combination of informational manipulations reinforced by terror. It is the tale of the failed struggle of a minor bureaucrat, Winston Smith, to fight the system, which aims to centralize power through the total eradication of individual personality. This is to be done through the destruction first, of privacy and of personal relationships and loyalties (sex, love, friendship, and family) and, finally, of conventional (i.e. conventionally ambiguous) language. The goal of the State that is, of its rulers, is power for its own sake by the absolute subjugation of individuality to the images and objectives of the rulers. The state does not want mere compliance, but the reshaping of mind and emotion as well.

Orwell was a fairly well known political essayist and novelist when he began the book in 1941. He was a passionate enemy of all totalitarianism, of the Left and of the Right, but his fiercest and best writing, such as Animal Farm (1945), which made him world-famous, was directed against Stalinist Communism even more than against Fascism, perhaps because the Communists made more use of the rhetoric of justice and equality.

He did not find it easy to write 1984. In a 1941 letter to his publisher, Frederic Warburg, he said:

"... this is a novel about the future -- ...a fantasy, but in the form of a naturalistic novel. That is what makes it a difficult job -- ...as a book of anticipation it would be comparatively simple to write." He shelved the book through most of World War II and finished it quickly in 1948, knowing that he was dying and hoping to make substantial money to leave his family.

Orwell was a realistic novelist, says Wm. Abrahms, and "...imagination, so essential to a fantasist, was never Orwell's strong suit..." So the book comes off, not as a science-fiction futuristic story (i.e. a work of anticipation), but with the air of the year 1948. It was "...a period of impoverishment" in postwar England, and "It was precisely that sense of impoverishment, of seediness and deprivation, of a greyness, sadness, drabness, and emptiness of the spirit, that Orwell projected in his fantasy of

the future...That was the element he breathed as a realistic novelist, and it imparts to 1984 its tone of truth suffered at first hand." (Abrahams, 1983)

Gloom and drabness are, indeed, the dominant moods of the book and the dominant responses to it of everyone I know who has read it. But this mood is not the "truth suffered at first hand" which explains the instant and continued success of this work or its continued grip on people's imaginations for almost forty years. The first American hardback printing was 244,000 copies. It has now had over 65 printings and sold over 10 million copies in the U.S. alone (Stansky, 1983). It has had similar success in other countries.

The lasting "truths suffered at first hand" in 1984, I believe, are all connected with psychology and with behavior control. Some are macro-truths, so to speak, and some micro-truths, big messages and little ones -- some are embodied in cryptic phrases whose meanings are so powerful or self evident that they have become part of the language:

Newspeak, telegraphed language, without nuances of meaning;

Doublethink, contradictions to be wholly believed;

Big Brother, the unseen Führer figure to be revered and feared;

Thought Police, who stamp out all signs of deviance.

Others are contained in sardonic phrases like the

Ministry of Truth, which corrupts language, defaces history, and manufactures propaganda; the

Ministry of Peace, which wages war; the

Ministry of Love, which maintains law and order through Thought Police; the

Ministry of Plenty, which maintains economic scarcity;

and slogans like

WAR IS PEACE

FREEDOM IS SLAVERY

IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH.

Still others are descriptions of life in 1984 whose economy belie their enormity:

The ever present TV screen, which observes as well as reveals;

The prohibition on sexuality.

The rituals of patriotic hate.

The virtues of family betrayal.

The genius of this book, in my opinion, is that it all makes such good sense intuitively. Intelligent lay readers can see how the grim caricatures of 1984 (and they are meant to be caricatures) are sketched from real life politics of social control. Social psychologists can see in them hypotheses about attitude change, obedience to authority, conformity, and every kind of social influence. Power seekers can take them as exaggerated instruction manuals for total control borrowed from the life and times of 20th Century revolutions in Russia, Italy, Germany, China, and Kampuchea (not a complete list).

What is common to all the themes of 1984 and important to us here is:

(1) They all address problems at the intersection of psychology and politics, and

(2) Behavior control technology is the shiniest set of tools at that intersection.

Behavior Control, Applied Psychology and Politics

Politics is the systematic negotiation and exercise of power over others. Behavior control is too. Therefore, there are political implications even to the design and development, let alone the use of behavior control technology. That is probably true of all applied psychology and, if you stretch your imagination even a little, maybe of all technology. The aim of science is to predict (i.e. understand) the lawful relationships of the physical world, and the aim of applied science and technology is to control them. Q.E.D. But you can be quite unimaginative, even dull witted, and still see how it is true of behavior control.

The threat of 1984 is not only that government will have absolute control of people, so that no unwanted deviance is possible. It is also that control can be systematized and made so successful in the destruction of individual personality that no one will want to deviate from the roles assigned to them by authority. The

gravity of the threat, in Orwell's novel, is reinforced by its mood of gloom and by the reign of terror that surrounds bureaucracy's (authority's) work.[1] But the main threat, and the warning of the work, comes not from terror but in its awful fulfillment of O'Brien's (the Party's spokesman and the novel's Antichrist) Satanic words:

> "You are imagining that there is something called human nature which will be outraged by what we do and will turn against us. But we create human nature. Men are infinitely malleable."

The expression of that re-created nature ends the book when Winston Smith, mentally and morally broken, realizes that his resistance to the Party has been a "...cruel, needless misunderstanding!" and himself a "stubborn, self-willed exile from the loving breast!... But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother."

---

[1] No distinction is drawn here between bureaucracy and authority because such distinctions are largely illusory. Hannah Arendt's analysis of Eichmann says it of the Holocaust, as does much other data of that calamity. Stanley Milgram's brilliant and now shamefully forbidden experiments on obedience to authority say it of formal research. And Shakespeare's King Lear says it most eloquently of the human condition: "Have you seen a farmer's dog bark at a beggar? And the creature run from the cur. There though mightst behold the great image of authority: A Dog's obeyed in office." (IV,6,155-160)

The culmination of the totalitarian revolution, in other words, comes when the totally controlled population loves its oppressor and rejoices in its slavery! At that point, we find ourselves in Brave New World, where terror is irrelevant to control because people want to do, courtesy of psychosocial and psychobiological means alike, what their governors, administrators, and, quite literally, their hatchers (creators) want them to do. The slogan of control there, endlessly repeated, is: "Everyone is happy now." Huxley's novel is set some 600 years later than Orwell's, but perhaps too modestly. It may not take that long to reshape human nature and switch the control systems from socially contagious lies and terror to individual emotional conditioning and pleasure drugs.

It also may not be necessary to anticipate such a world for the same reasons that Orwell's preliminary total state has not already come to pass and that Stalinism at its most powerful and pernicious was largely a failure. For one thing, people may not want power for its own sake, even if the tools of total control are available. For another, a world in which individualism has been totally eradicated may not be much more fun for the bosses than it is for the serfs. Anyway, not all deviance is dangerous. Some kinds are engaging and amusing, some are economically valuable, and some may even be harnessed to the maintenance of power or the achievement of the goals for which it is instrumental. And finally, the mechanisms for insuring the continuity of a controlling class

are not apparent. Lines of succession, historically, have always been "chancey," and competition for power within every ruling class eventually shatters the most monolithic seeming structures of government. Most linear historical predictions, like scientific ones, are doomed to fail in this pretzel-shaped universe. And 1984, accordingly, is a fantasy unlikely to be realized; Brave New World even more so.

This does not mean they are vain fantasies, however, which perchance have caught the world's fancy but should not bother psychologists. On the contrary, they are imaginative extrapolations which behavior control students would do well to read and ponder and better still to invent and write -- for the threat of total political control is one line-of-possible-fulfillment of the promise of ever improving biomedical and psychosocial therapeutic control. By either name, it would be finally realized when unwanted deviance could be prevented or cured with everyone grateful to the controllers for securing their conformity.

The important thing about behavior control technology is that the whole is more than the parts. Education, persuasion and drugs are all well known, and the specific things they do are not changed by lumping them together and thinking about them as a package. But when I suddenly have the insight that they are all behavior control, not just teaching, selling and calming down, I have captured,

in that abstraction, a possibility for systematized action that the parts, individually, did not inspire. When I then hook it up to a state, a society, a collective of people rather than just individuals, I come up with 1984 or Brave New World or still other utopian visions.

Orwell and Huxley have given us utopian visions, more precisely dystopian visions -- the flip side of benign utopia -- of the distant future implicit in unchecked uses of behavior control technology. This is valuable because scenarios of what the future may really bring are anything but obvious, just as past history has been anything but continuous (Thompson, 1971), and the optimistic disposition of civilized behavior scientists, doubtless including much of this audience, is to think that their inventions are benign and that the progress of civilization is linear. I do not mean to oppose this fallacious optimism with the sin of pessimism, but only to argue that futuristic fantasies do a service to realism. The uses to which society may put invention are uncertain and undependable at all times, and there are no "best of times." Neil Postman, for instance, in The Disappearance of Childhood, figures that at least 75 million innocents have been slaughtered in this world in his lifetime, not including, "...as Russell Baker puts it," ... "those killings that are done ... in the name of private enterprise, e.g. street killings, family killings, robbery killing, etc." (1982, p. 93). The most civilized countries have been party, even pre-eminent, in the massacres. Another example: It is less than 20 years since the

barbarity of capital punishment was eliminated from these United States, and now it is back, to public applause and with otherwise decent people behaving like learned savages in black robes debating the legalities, never mind the virtues, of how best to kill people. Yet again, do you think it is merely futuristic fantasy to guess that the current hysteria over sexual encounters between adults and children will promote demands for the biochemical control of sexual impulses -- in a society that castrates people for sex crimes, sexualizes the sale of everything from soda pop to laundry soap, and makes of children its most glamorous and public sex objects?

It is not necessary to be baleful or gloomy about the future, however, or even to be outraged by society's lunacies or barbarities, to see the complexity of the moral and practical judgments about behavior control which conditions conspire to promote: The technology of behavior control improves all the time, tempting us to use it therapeutically. But the ideological constraints on its voluntary or mandatory use become harder to specify and less imperative. The progress of biological science makes the very boundaries which define life, let alone humanity and autonomy, more and more permeable. And the diveristy of a free society and the promotion of civil liberties within it make more vague the boundaries between illness and crime, between treatment and performance enhancement, between education, religion and recreation, between prosocial, selfish, and antisocial behavior, and between permissible and proscribable

deviance. With our intellectual philosophies of humanity battered, our social conventions frayed, and our moral traditions in doubt, where do we look for broad perspectives on the meaning of behavior control? Why do we need to? Because without such perspectives, we make a Faustian pact with nature and society, in which we gain the world of our enterprise at peril of our moral responsibilities to humanity, in ignorant indifference to the world we help to shape. To get them, we must develop utopian vision.

The Uses of Utopia

Johanno Strasser said of postwar Europe, "This was no bull market for utopias. People had their hands full dealing with the present." Doubtless it is also true now. But the present has us immersed in our own "intrusive technologies," as James Rule calls them, without means of defining the relationship between technological and human progress. The mere "technological mastery of technological problems," the "despotism" of modern technology, threatens to pervert progress -- "because progress has lost the gauge by which to measure what is both feasible and humane" (Strasser, 1983, p. 153). And we will not get it back, I believe, by trying to resurrect the very moral traditions which science and technology undermines.

We can help progress, I believe, by learning to invoke imagination to evolve visions of how, at their best, we think human beings should live, individually and in society. What would a fulfilled, mature human being be like? What would such a creature seek? How would it find it? What would be its relationship with its own kind? What would it live for? What sacrifice? What go to rest in peace for having looked back upon in satisfaction? How would the kinship and intercourse of human beings contribute to all this?

Corollary to this vision, and closer to the point of our daily work, must be a subordinate but still visionary image -- of how our work, individually, and our craft, collectively, can serve or subvert the larger utopian vision.

This may sound like ethical whistling in the dark but there are at least two arguments from the history of science and technology, one from the philosophy of science, and a couple examples from the works of distinguished psychologists, that favor such an exercise.

The history of science and technology suggests, first of all, that the notion of "technological imperative," that is of the idea that, in effect, a technology dictates its own use, is false. Technology does not use itself, and its consequences, therefore, are not inevitable and not predictable. The Chinese invented gunpowder and used it for firecrackers but not for armaments. They invented moveable type but did not make a printing press. The

Aztecs invented the wheel but used it only for toys, not for transportation. More immediately, the proportion of privately held firearms to people in Israel must exceed that of the United States by 10 to 1. But the proportions of murders are almost the opposite -- and most murders in Israel are not from gunshot wounds. The differences in behavior are not functions of technological imperatives.

Not only is the use of technology not imperative, but its very invention is less than obvious. In fact, as Eugene Ferguson observes,

> "Many features ... of the objects that a technologist thinks about cannot be reduced to unambiguous verbal descriptions... His mind's eye is a well developed organ that ... forms ... new or modified images as his thoughts require ... Pyramids, cathedrals, and rockets exist not because of geometry, theory of structures or thermodynamics, but because they were first a picture, literally a vision, in the minds of those that built them." (Ferguson, 1977, p. 827)

That is also why, of course, there is no such thing as an "optimal" design for an easy chair, a chandelier, a motorcycle, or a bridge. Physics limits their designs but does not determine them.

What is true of material invention is also true of scientific theory, as it is of musical composition. Beethoven audited in his mind the symphonies he could compose but not hear. Einstein said that he first imagined the universe because he desperately needed for it to be whole, and then laboriously translated his imagery into the cognitive hardware of mathematics and physics.

Now what is utopia but the image of earthly paradise, or dystopia but the picture of hell on earth? If philosophers and essayists can envision the politics, economics and sociology of utopia -- and that is precisely what makes 1984 and Brave New World and, indeed, behavior control, so interesting -- then should not behavior scientists imagine the psychology of paradise?

The question is worth asking even if none exists because the shape of a better society can only come from design and invention, not by accident. And social inventions, like the others, can begin as visions in the minds of their inventors. If, as some say, "there is nothing more practical than a good theory," maybe there may be nothing more socially useful than a good utopia.

The argument for utopianism from philosophy of science is more difficult, and shortage of time mercifully prevents me from elaborating (or confusing) it much here. It is taken from Edward Sampson on "Scientific paradigms and social values" (1978) and from Hubert Dreyfus on "knowledge, values, and nihilism" (1981), both

based in turn on Thomas Kuhn's The Structure of scientific revolutions (1970). They argue that the classic (Paradigm 1) view of the natural sciences which dominates social psychology and nurtures modern technology gives an incomplete picture of reality. It hides the truths of cultural and historical experience, wrongly promotes the idea that life is meaningless, and falsely suggests that everything can be brought under our control. They believe reality offers more latitude for human development than our scientific conventions do. This makes a case for utopian industry to explore it.

Utopian Psychologists

Psychologists have not totally ignored utopia. According to Morawski, G. Stanley Hall, William McDougal, Hugo Munsterberg, and John B. Watson all wrote utopian essays early in this century (1982). But it has not been very popular since. What has been getting more popular since the 1960s is what Krasner calls "a utopian stream" in psychological writing. He means by that "an ethical concern for the social implications of behavior control" and "blueprints for a better life." (1971) At first, he identified that writing with behavior modification. Lately, he connects it with applied behavior analysis, community psychology, social ecology, health psychology, preventive psychology and social policy. He calls it all "the nusquamization of psychology and society" (nusquam is Latin and utopia is Greek) (Krasner, unpublished ms. 1983).

The move to involve psychology in social action and its potential importance has become a prominent professional theme. Carl Rogers, for instance, asks:

> "... whether we dare to turn from being a past-oriented remedial technology to a focus of future-oriented planning, taking our part in a chaotic world ... Will we continue to be peripheral to our society, or will we risk the dangers of being a significant social force?" (1973, p. 387)

And George Miller says more broadly:

> "I believe that any broad ... application of psychological knowledge to human problems will ... change ... our conception of ourselves and of how we live and love and work together. Instead of inventing some new technique for modifying the environment, we are proposing to tamper with the adaptive process itself. Such an innovation is quite different from a 'technological fix.'"(1969, 1063-1065)

With respect, none of these -- not Krasner's nor Rogers' nor Miller's advocacy of a socially significant psychology is what I mean by "utopian vision." Valuable and important as those things are, they are not what I am talking about here. I am not advocating action, but contemplation. Utopia is a vision, not a

plan. It is meant to inspire imagination and reflection, not to provoke legislation and reform. It expresses ideals, not policies. It is eschatological, not contemporary. To be real, it almost has to be fiction. If it can be wholly implemented, it is too timid, just as, if it is not based on the stuff of real life, as science, technology and society are understood or can be sensibly extrapolated, then it is too far removed in the other direction.

Social action and reform are good things, but they are not utopian in the sense I mean it.

The problem of "gauging human progress" is not one of what to do tomorrow with this or that technology. There are plenty of people properly worrying about that. The problem is how to inspire the kind of thinking that will make what I want to do for a myriad of tomorrows into something more than a "technological fix." It addresses how I want things to end up as a result of my having lived and worked, not just how I want them to work out this school year or election or legislative round. I am looking for a source of inspiration writ large, not for motivation in lower case. It is not a more worthy problem, but it is a different one.

To my knowledge, B.F. Skinner alone, among contemporary psychologists, has composed a true utopia in Walden Two. It is sensibly based on the principles of learning, as Skinner has elaborated them, describes conditions of life which hope to optimize human

potential, and portrays a society which Skinner, even within the novel, cannot figure out how to get to or how to sustain without a larger society surrounding it.

It is as well that he cannot. If he could, he would present the basis of a political movement, not a moral vision and not an invitation to ethical invention.

Psychologists deal with the essential stuff of the social order, that is, the dynamics of behavior. It is what takes them into behavior control, and what mandates that they should envision the social order as they study and develop its stuff. The "utopian imperative," I believe, is what is enjoined by the Biblical statement, "Without vision, the people will perish." (Proverbs, 29:18). It may be an enlightening challenge for students of behavior control.

London: B.C. 1984

References

Abrahams, W. Nineteen Eighty-Four: The novel. In Stansky, P. (Ed.) On nineteen eighty-four. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983.

Arendt, H. The banality of evil.

Delgado, J. Physical control of the mind. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Dreyfus, H.L. Knowledge and human values: A genealogy of nihilism. Teachers College Record, 1981, 82 (3), 507-520.

Ferguson, E.S. The mind's eye: Non-verbal thought in technology. Science, 1977, 197 (4306), 826-836.

Huxley, A. Brave new world. New York: Harper & Row, 1932.

Krasner, L. Behavior therapy. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Annual review of Psychology (Vol. 22). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, 1971.

Krasner, L. Nusquamas for sale: A new label for an old process. Unpublished ms., March, 1983.

Kuhn, T.S. The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

London, P. Behavior control (2nd Ed.). New York: New American Library, 1977. (Orig: Harper & Row, 1969).

Milgram, S. Obedience to authority. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1974.

London: B.C. 1984

Miller, G.A. Psychology as a means of promoting human welfare. American Psychologist, 1969, 24, 1063-1075.

Morawski, J.G. Assessing psychology's moral heritage through our neglected utopias. American Psychologist, 1982, 37, 1082-1095.

Orwell, F. 1984. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949.

Postman, N. The disappearance of childhood. New York: Dell, 1982.

Rogers, C.R. Some new challenges. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 379-387.

Rule, J.B. 1984 -- The ingredients of totalitarianism. In Howe, I. (Ed.), 1984 revisited: Totalitarianism in our century New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

Sampson, E.E. Scientific paradigms and social values: Wanted -- a scientific revolution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36 (11), 1332-1343.

Skinner, B.F. Walden two. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Stansky, P. (Ed.). On nineteen eighty-four. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983.

Strasser, J. 1984: Decade of the experts? In Howe, I. (Ed.). 1984 revisited: Totalitarianism in our century. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1983.

Thompson, W.J. At the edge of history: Speculations on the transformation of culture. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1971.